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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

1. The total N to determine the response rate (54%) is not mentioned in the Results, nor is the response rate mentioned in the Results, the first mention is in Limitations. It seems that it should be in the Results section.

2. The sentence beginning in line 181 does not read well. I had to read it several times before I understood what the author was trying to say, this should be reworded. The mention of percentages twice which pertain to 2 different things is confusing.

3. The table seems to have some incomplete data. For example, 8/10 respondents in Belgium chose NG hydration after failed oral rehydration, what do the other 20% choose?

Overall I found this article interesting, especially as a EM physician in the United States. I find it interesting that nasogastric tube rehydration would be done at a high rate as a second line treatment for dehydration and is cited as having less complications. Is this a very small tube? I know that the NG in adults is not a patient favorite. Also, with the availability of ondansetron now, the antiquated guidelines likely need to be readdressed, and the continuation of this study will likely be helpful in the creation of updated guidelines.
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